DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 641 UD 017 144

AUTHOR Leaf, Jeanette B.
TITLE Project Mini-Teachers, 1975-1976 Academic Year.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 40p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 20-63436

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Chinese; Elementary Education; *English (Second Language); *High School Students; *Immigrants; Italian Americans; *Program Evaluation; Puerto Ricans; *Remedial Reading; *Tutoring
IDENTIFIERS Greeks; Haitians; Israelis; New York (New York); Umbrella Projects

ABSTRACT

Elementary school students who were recent immigrants from Puerto Rico, Haiti, Greece, Italy, Hong Kong and Israel participated in this after school program. The goal of the program was to increase student proficiency in reading, writing, and speaking English. Ninety-seven students from two elementary schools were selected on the basis of counselor or teacher recommendation. Non-English speaking applicants were given priority for acceptance into the program. The program provided for tutoring by high school seniors, verbal and written exercises and games and study materials developed for the students. Achievement tests in reading were administered to the students on a pre and post test basis. Personal data forms and questionnaires were administered to tutors, students, and parents. The results of this program evaluation shows that students improved skills in reading, writing, listening, and speaking. No differences were found between pre and post test scores for tutors. An appendix includes copies of questionnaires administered to all participants. (JP)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED142641

EVALUATION REPORT

Function No. 20-63436

PROJECT MINI-TEACHERS

1975-1976 ACADEMIC YEAR

Dr. Jeanette B. Leaf

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD 17141

An Evaluation of Selected New York City Umbrella Programs funded under a Special Grant of the New York State Legislature performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1975-1976 school year

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

BOARD OF COUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE PROGRAM	1
II.	EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES	3
	Evaluation Objectives	3
	Data Gathering Instruments	3
	Sampling Procedures	5
	Dates of Evaluative Procedures	5
	Methods of Data Treatment	6
III.	FINDINGS	7
	Demographic Findings	7
	Evaluation Objectives Findings	8
IV.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	14
	TABLES	16
	APPENDIX	27

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS IN PROJECT MINI-TEACHERS.....	16
II.	PROGRAM ENROLLMENT AND ATTRITION.....	17
III.	t-TESTS FOR VARIABLES WORD KNOWLEDGE, READING COMPREHENSION, AND TOTAL READING: PRE-TEST, POST-TEST COMPARISON OF MEANS P.S. 316.....	18
IV.	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: A COMPARISON OF TEST PERFORMANCE BY GRADE P.S. 316.....	19
V.	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: A COMPARISON OF TEST PERFORMANCE BY SEX P.S. 316.....	20
VI.	A NORM-REFERENCED COMPARISON OF PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST PERFORMANCE P.S.316.....	21
VII.	t-TESTS FOR NEW YORK CITY LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT BATTERY: PRE-TEST, POST-TEST COMPARISON OF MEANS I.S. 320.....	22
VIII.	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: A COMPARISON OF TEST PERFORMANCE BY GRADE I.S. 320.....	23
IX.	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: A COMPARISON OF TEST PERFORMANCE BY SEX I.S. 320.....	24
X.	GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAM TUTORS.....	25
XI.	t-TESTS FOR GORDON PERSONAL INVENTORY: PRE-TEST, POST-TEST COMPARISON OF MEANS.....	26

CHAPTER ONE

THE PROGRAM

During the 1975-76 academic year, Project Mini-Teachers provided extra after-school instruction to elementary school children with the purpose of improving the participants' English language skills. Located in the Crown Heights section of Brooklyn, New York, the Mini-Teachers Program was designed primarily to assist students who are comparatively recent immigrants. The major ethnic backgrounds of participants was Puerto Rican and Haitian with smaller proportions of enrollees who were Greek, Italian, Chinese, or Israeli.

With improvement of language skills being the primary objective of the Mini-Teachers Program, educational activities centered on the task of raising the level of student proficiency in reading, writing, and speaking the English language. The major method of instruction was small-group tutoring, the groups being formed on the basis of grade level.

The participating elementary schools from which the tutees were selected are P.S.316 and I.S.320. Forty-five students were selected from each school on the basis of counselor or teacher recommendation. Non-English speaking applicants were given first priority for acceptance into the program whereas those with learning disabilities were accepted on a space-available basis.

Tutoring took place three times weekly in each of the two elementary schools from 3-5 p.m. The thirty tutors in the program were high school students, predominantly seniors, from Prospect Heights High School. At each school the tutoring activities were under the direct supervision of a licensed teacher.

The entire program staff, consisting of project coordinator, two teachers, and thirty tutors developed verbal and written exercises, games, and study materials for the ninety tutees. On-going in-service training and conferences were scheduled to assist tutors in learning techniques and in coping with the problems that were encountered. The small tutor-tutee ratio of one-three insured a highly individualized learning experience for the participants.

Project Mini-Teachers as scheduled for the academic year began to fully function on November 25, 1975, and ended activities on June 30, 1976. By the end of the academic year tutoring was provided to program participants on eighty-two school days.

CHAPTER TWO

EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

I. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

Based on the objectives as set forth in the program description, the following are the evaluation objectives of this study:

Evaluation Objective #1: To determine, whether, as a result of participation in the Reading component of the program, the reading level of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the pre-test score and the post-test score.

Evaluation Objective #2: To determine, whether, as a result of participation in the Communications Skills component of the program, the Writing, Listening, and Speaking levels of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test score.

Evaluation Objective #3: To determine, whether, as a result of participation in the program, the tutors show a significant rise in self-esteem and personal values.

Evaluation Objective #4: To determine whether the implementation of the program coincides with the program as described in the project proposal.

II. Data Gathering Instruments

Metropolitan Achievement Tests

The elementary level of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests in Reading were administered on a pre-test and post-test basis to students at P.S.316. The two subtests that were administered were Word Knowledge and Reading. Scores yielded from these subtests are measures of students' reading vocabulary and reading comprehension. Form F of the battery was administered as a pre-test, whereas Form H was used for the post-test.

New York City Language Assessment Battery (LAB) - English

The LAB consists of four subtests: Reading, Writing, Listening, and Speaking. At I.S. 320 the appropriate level of the LAB was administered to program participants on a pre-test and post-test basis. Depending on a student's grade in school, either Level II or Level III of the battery was assigned.

Gordon Personal Inventory

Tutors in the program completed the Gordon Personal Inventory on a pre-test, post-test basis. This inventory provides measures on four traits, these traits being Cautiousness, Original Thinking, Personal Relations, and Vigor.

Tutor and Tutee Personal Data Form

A Personal Data Form was separately constructed by the Evaluator-Consultant for both tutors and tutees in order to systematically obtain basic demographic data. This data was intended to provide a precise description of the program population, and a basis for inter-group statistical comparisons. Among the data requested were Sex, Date of Birth, Place of Birth, Languages Spoken, and Ethnic Group Identification.

Tutor, Tutee, Parent Questionnaires

Questionnaires were constructed and administered by the program coordinator and teachers. The purpose of these questionnaires was to obtain attitudinal information regarding the expectations and perceptions of the program participants. Tutors, tutees, and parents

of tutees were asked through a series of questions to indicate their degree of satisfaction with the program.

III. Sampling Procedures

Students were selected for participation in Project Mini-Teachers on the basis of teacher-counselor recommendation. Academic need and interest in participation were the factors used to determine selection rather than statistical procedures such as random sampling. Non-English speaking students were especially encouraged to enroll in the program.

It was not possible to undertake matched group comparisons for assessment of program effectiveness since students requiring the extra instruction provided by this program would have been systematically eliminated from participation.

IV. Dates of Evaluative Procedures

The majority of students at P.S. 316 were pre-tested either on November 25, 1975, or December 2, 1975. Students at I.S. 320 were pre-tested during the school testing program on October 20, 1975. New students added to the program subsequent to these dates were tested at various intervals. Among these students, only those pre-tested by February 1, 1976, have been included in this evaluation.

Tutor and tutee personal data forms were completed by March 18, 1976.

Post-testing, which included academic tests and questionnaires, was completed by April 29, 1976.

V. Methods of Data Treatment

General frequencies are conducted on data obtained through the tutor and tutee personal data forms in order to provide a detailed description of the program population. Among the characteristics which are components of the profiles are: Sex, Age, Grade, Place of Birth, and Length of Residency in the U. S.

Self-pairing t-tests for correlated means are performed for each of the various tests taken by the program population in order to assess pre-test, post-test differences. In the absence of an adequate control group, self-pairing enables each students to serve as his own control counterpart, thus reducing extraneous influences on the variables being measured.

One-way analysis of variance statistics are computed to delineate which factors, if any, underlie statistically significant pre-test, post-test differences.

Finally, general frequencies of responses to the tutor, tutee, and parent questionnaires are tabulated. This subjective, qualitative data is a supplement to the statistical tests undertaken in assessing the relationship between the Mini-Teachers Program and students' academic progress.

CHAPTER THREE

FINDINGS

I. Demographic Findings

By February 1, 1976, Project Mini-Teachers had provided extra after-school instruction to 97 students for the 1975-76 academic year. Table I indicates that 53% of the students tutored were male, and 47% were female. The tutored students ranged in grade level from grade 3 to grade 8, and in age from approximately 15 years to 7 years old.

Project Mini-Teachers serves primarily an immigrant population. Seventy-two percent of the students were born either in Haiti or in a Spanish-speaking country. Almost one-fourth of the students (24%) had lived in the U. S. for less than one year at the time of enrollment in the program.

Table I also shows a difference between the two schools, P.S. 316 and I.S. 320, in the demographic characteristics of the students enrolled in the program. Most notably, at P.S. 316 61% of the students were male and 43% were not born in the U. S. On the other hand, at I.S. 320 the majority of students were female (55%), and 98% of the students were non-native to the U. S.

Table II shows that 98% of the students were enrolled in the program either during the end of November or the beginning of December, depending on the school they attended. By April the overall attrition rate was 31%. For the two schools individually,

43% of the students at P.S. 316 and 20% of the students at I.S. 320 withdrew from the program. The major reasons for which students were discharged were moving to another school district and parental request.

II. Evaluation Objectives Findings

Evaluation Objective #1: To determine, whether as a result of participation in the Reading component of the program, the reading level of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the pre-test score and the post-test score.

P.S. 316

Tables III - VI provide pre-test and post-test statistical data for the Metropolitan Achievement Tests in Reading which were administered at P.S. 316. Table III indicates that a comparison of student performance on the pre- and post-tests yields a high and significant difference ($t=7.47$, $p=0.00$). The mean grade equivalent for the Total Reading score was 2.93 at the time of pre-testing and 3.67 at post-testing. This represents a gain of seven months during the five month period of December 1975 - April 1976 which is included in this report.

Comparison of performance on the pre-test and post-test by grade and sex is provided in Tables IV and V through the technique of one-way analysis of variance. Table IV indicates that performance did not differ by grade level on either the pre-test and post-tests, or on the individual subtests. Thus regardless of grade level, which ranged from grade 3 through grade 6, students achieved at approximately the same level on both the pre- and post-tests.

Table V indicates a major difference in pre- and post-tests by Sex on the Word Knowledge subtest, with the female students scoring

higher than the male students. A significant difference was also found on the post-test Total Reading score, although this finding is not as critical since it largely reflects the sex difference already mentioned on the Word Knowledge subtest.

Comparisons were not conducted to note the effect of the criterion Attendance on post-test performance, the reason being that only one student who had attended less than 60% of the scheduled sessions took both the pre- and post-tests.

A norm-referenced approach to considering the pre-test and post-test scores is given in Table VI in order to compare the program participants with students nationally. The limitation placed on this method of analysis is that norms are given only for grades 3 and 4 on the form of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests used at P.S. 316. Thus results for students in grades 5 and 6 are compared with grade 4 norms. Nevertheless, Table VI shows that for all grades in the program, as a whole the students improved their standing within their normative group between the pre-test and the post-test. The greatest improvement is noted for students in grade 3 who moved from the 46th percentile at the time of pre-test to the 58th percentile at post-test.

I.S. 320

At I.S. 320 Reading improvement as well as improvement of Communication Skills was an objective as indicated by the test measures used and the fact that 98% of the students were not born in the U. S., therefore requiring instruction in this area. Thus in the following discussion

of pre-test and post-test differences at I.S. 320, Evaluation Objective #1 as previously cited is considered jointly with Evaluation Objective #2, the latter being:

Evaluation Objective #2: To determine, whether as a result of participation in the Communication Skills component of the program, the Writing, Listening, and Speaking levels of the students will show a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test score.

Table VII indicates a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores for Reading (Evaluation Objective #1) as well as for Writing, Listening, and Speaking (Evaluation Objective #2). This significant difference is based on a t-test of raw score pre- and post-test means for each of the individual subtests.

Table VIII, a comparison of test performance by Grade, indicates a significant group difference for the Listening pre-test only. Mean scores for students in grade 7 were higher than for students in grades 6 or 8.

Table IX, a comparison by Sex, shows a significant difference for the Listening post-test only, with the female students achieving higher scores than the male students.

Although the t-test analyses yield significant pre- and post-test differences for each of the four variables assessed, severe limitations are placed on interpretation of these data since only raw scores are available with no conversions to standard scores or grade percentiles. The only comparative data available are Board of Education cut-off scores beyond which students are considered effective in English (Memorandum,

Dr. Anthony Polemeni, May 1975). The cut-off scores for students by grade level and the actual pre-test and post-test scores at I.S. 320 are as follows:

	Grade	Cut-Off	Mean Pre-Test	Mean Post-Test
Level II	6	169	74	96
Level III	7	163	97	115
Level III	8	174	75	106

Thus, although improvement is noted, the students remain far below the cut-off point deemed effective in English. Although an improvement is shown statistically further inferences on actual academic improvement are not possible in the absence of more detailed normative data.

Evaluation Objective #3: To determine, whether as a result of participation in the program, the tutors show a significant rise in self-esteem and personal values.

The tutors are a vital element in Project Mini-Teachers since a major part of the instruction is conducted by them. Table X shows that the 30 tutors in the program were all female, planned to attend college and, with one exception, were in grade 12. The majority had high school averages above 80, were Black, and spoke only English fluently. Fifteen of the tutors (50%) aspired to a medically-related profession, with only one student indicating teaching as a career choice.

Table XI indicates no significant differences between the pre-test and the post-test on the four traits measured by the Gordon Personal Inventory. This result is not unexpected since personality traits do not undergo great changes, especially during a relatively short

period of time such as the case in question.

Given the capability of the personality inventory used in this program, a comparison of the tutors with a peer group is more feasible than the notion of change in traits. Table X indicates that the scores of the tutors are largely in the range of the 70th - 80th percentiles, an above average range. Thus the tutors appear to be high on the traits being assessed. They are likely to be individuals who are cautious, are intellectually curious, who have great faith and trust in people, and who are vigorous and energetic (Manual, Gordon Personal Inventory, 1963).

Evaluation Objective #4: To determine, whether the implementation of the program coincides with the program as described in the project proposal.

Several questionnaires were constructed by the project coordinator to obtain tutee, tutor, and parent perceptions of the program's effectiveness. These questionnaires and a breakdown of responses are included in the Appendix. Some of the pertinent findings from the questionnaire are the following:

81% of the tutees felt they were helped by the program; 82% expressed their desire to continue in the program the following year.

Among the tutors, 90% felt that the tutees had benefitted from the program; 97% felt successful in serving as a model for the tutees.

Of the parents who responded, 80% wanted their child to continue in the program next year; 89% would recommend the program

to others; 66% felt that their child had benefitted from participation.

Based on these responses, and on observations and discussions with the program staff, it appears that the implementation of Project Mini-Teachers largely coincides with the program description as modified. Students were tutored three days a week, a modification from four days, from 3-5 p.m. They received extra instruction in reading, writing, and communication skills. A discrepancy was noted in starting date. Although the program was scheduled to begin on October 15, 1975, the earliest date for pupil participation was November 25, 1975.

Many of the materials used in the program were reproduced in quantity by the program staff. Greater utilization could be made of workbooks and programmed learning guides that enable students to progress at individual rates.

The program participants at each of the two schools differed markedly in ethnic background as discussed earlier. With half of the participants at P.S. 316 being born in the U.S., in future years efforts should be made to ascertain that recent immigrants possibly in greater need of instruction than native students are not being excluded. Several students at P.S. 316 were reading at or above grade level on the pre-test.

The program facilities were adequate, especially in view of the limitation of only one teacher at each school.

Since last year's evaluation was not available it is not possible to note whether recommendations that were possibly made were incorporated during the current academic year.

CHAPTER FOUR

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, 97 students were enrolled in Project Mini-Teachers during its operation for the 1975-76 academic year. The majority of these students were non-native and of Haitian ethnic background.

Students at P.S. 316 showed statistically significant differences in Reading between their pre-test and post-test scores. Statistically significant differences were found for students at I.S. 320 in the areas of Reading, Writing, Listening, and Speaking although the interpretability of their gain scores in terms of percentiles or grade equivalents is not possible.

No differences were found between pre-test and post-test scores for tutors. This is probably due to the constancy of the personality traits being assessed. On each of the scales, the tutors' scores were above the 60th percentile.

Based on these findings, especially at P.S. 316, it is possible to conclude that providing extra instruction is related to improvement of academic deficiencies. A recommendation for continuing the program is in order because the needs of the students are such that extra instruction is necessary to close or narrow the educational gap that exists between the level of academic performance versus the grade level of the students. The program should be continued with the following modifications:

1. Selection of Tests: the same test instrument should be used at both participating schools in order to lend a unifying element to the program objectives and evaluation. A test should be selected which provides normative data representing the entire range of participants' grade in school.

2. Pre-Testing: pre-testing should be scheduled for the first week of the program in order to provide an accurate measure of the students' achievement level at the time of entry. Test results obtained at I.S. 320 on October 20th through the regular school testing program preceded the start of the Mini-Teachers program by over one month.

3. Starting Date: the program should begin to fully function as early in the school year as possible in order to be more effective and to maximize students' opportunity for learning improvement.

4. Selection of Students: since the nature and purpose of instruction is compensatory, only students achieving below grade level should be enrolled in the program.

5. Reduction of Attrition: a more complete understanding of the nature of the program and its hours by both students and their parents prior to student enrollment may reduce attrition and assure a student population that is better able to complete the program.

Given the environment in which Project Mini-Teachers functions and the language barriers confronting many of the students, this program provides an important service to its community.

TABLE I

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS IN PROJECT MINI-TEACHERS

	P.S. 316		P.S. 320		ROW TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
SEX						
Male	28	61	23	45	51	53
Female	18	39	28	55	46	47
Column Total	46	100	51	100	97	100
GRADE						
3	5	11	-	-	5	5
4	31	67	-	-	31	32
5	6	13	-	-	6	6
6	4	9	20	39	24	25
7	-	-	18	35	18	19
8	-	-	13	26	13	13
Column Total	46	100	51	100	97	100
YEAR BIRTH						
1960	-	-	1	2	1	1
1961	-	-	5	10	5	5
1962	1	2	2	4	3	3
1963	1	2	23	45	24	25
1964	6	13	15	29	21	22
1965	5	11	-	-	5	5
1966	24	22	-	-	24	25
1967	4	9	-	-	4	4
1968	3	7	-	-	3	3
Unknown	2	4	5	10	7	7
Column Total	46	100	51	100	97	100

	P.S. 316		P.S. 320		ROW TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
PLACE OF BIRTH						
United States	23	50	-	-	23	24
Spanish Speaking Country	7	15	9	18	16	16
Haiti	13	28	41	80	54	56
Unknown	3	7	1	2	4	4
Column Total	46	100	51	100	97	100
LENGTH OF RESIDENCY IN UNITED STATES						
Native	23	50	-	-	23	24
Less than 1 year	1	2	22	43	23	24
12-17 months	3	7	5	10	8	8
18-23 months	9	20	5	10	14	14
24-29 months	2	4	2	4	4	4
30-35 months	-	-	4	8	4	4
36 or more months	-	-	4	8	4	4
Unknown	8	17	9	18	17	18
Column Total	46	100	51	100	97	100

TABLE II

PROGRAM ENROLLMENT AND ATTRITION

DATE FIRST ATTENDED PROGRAM	P.S. 316		I.S. 320		Row Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Nov. 25 - Nov. 30	-	-	49	96	49	51
Dec. 1 - Dec. 15	45	98	1	2	46	47
Dec. 16 - Dec. 31	1	2	-	-	1	1
Jan. 1 - Feb. 1	-	-	1	2	1	1
Column Total	46	100	51	100	97	100

DATE LAST ATTENDED PROGRAM						
Dec. 1 - Dec. 15	1	2	-	-	1	1
Dec. 16 - Dec. 31	6	13	-	-	6	6
Jan. 1 - Jan. 15	9	20	1	2	10	10
Jan. 16 - Jan. 31	2	4	2	4	4	4
Feb.	2	4	5	10	7	7
March	-	-	2	4	2	2
Still in Attendance	26	57	41	80	67	69
Column Total	46	100	51	100	97	100

REASON DISCHARGED						
Moved	7	35	4	40	11	37
Parents' Request	10	50	-	-	10	33
Non-Attendance	3	15	-	-	3	10
Inconvenient Hours	-	-	4	40	4	13
Other	-	-	2	20	2	6
Column Total	20	100	10	100	30	100

TABLE III

t-TESTS FOR VARIABLES WORD KNOWLEDGE, READING COMPREHENSION, AND TOTAL READING:
PRE-TEST, POST-TEST COMPARISON OF MEANS
P.S. 316

VARIABLE	N of CASES	MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENT	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	CORRELATION	t-VALUE	df	ONE-TAIL PROBABILITY
WORD KNOWLEDGE								
Pre-Test	26	3.15	1.34	0.26	.97	7.67	25	0.00
Post-Test		3.67	1.26	0.24				
READING COMPREHENSION								
Pre-Test	26	2.71	1.21	0.24	.78	5.99	25	0.00
Post-Test		3.65	1.19	0.23				
TOTAL READING								
Pre-Test	26	2.93	1.18	0.23	.91	7.47	25	0.00
Post-Test		3.67	1.19	0.23				

TABLE IV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: A COMPARISON OF TEST PERFORMANCE BY GRADE
P.S. 316

VARIABLE	PRE-TEST			POST-TEST		
WORD KNOWLEDGE	MEAN	S.D.	N	MEAN	S.D.	N
Grade						
3	3.375	0.550	4	3.733	0.351	3
4	3.079	0.662	29	3.536	0.750	14
5	3.233	1.033	6	3.680	0.986	5
6	3.625	3.205	4	4.075	3.028	4
Total	3.179	1.097	43	3.669	1.263	26
F = 0.3309	df = 3,39	p = N.S.		F = 0.1734	df = 3,22	p = N.S.
READING COMPREHENSION						
Grade						
3	2.675	0.479	4	3.833	0.723	3
4	2.769	0.866	29	3.757	0.864	14
5	2.383	0.643	6	3.180	0.733	5
6	3.150	2.901	4	3.750	2.636	4
Total	2.742	1.097	43	3.654	1.186	26
F = 0.3915	df = 3,39	p = N.S.		F = 0.3053	df = 3,22	p = N.S.
TOTAL READING						
Grade						
3	3.050	0.465	4	3.767	0.513	3
4	2.924	0.665	29	3.657	0.788	14
5	2.817	0.631	6	3.440	0.673	5
6	3.350	2.974	4	3.950	2.838	4
Total	2.960	1.004	43	3.673	1.186	26
F = 0.2508	df = 3,39	p = N.S.		F = 0.1290	df = 3,22	p = N.S.

TABLE V

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: A COMPARISON OF TEST PERFORMANCE BY SEX
P.S. 316

VARIABLE	PRE-TEST			POST-TEST		
WORD KNOWLEDGE	MEAN	S.D.	N	MEAN	S.D.	N
Sex						
Male	2.900	0.857	26	3.233	0.588	15
Female	3.606	1.400	17	4.264	1.682	11
Total	3.179	1.096	43	3.669	1.263	26
F = 4.6203	df = 1,41	p = .05		F = 4.8788	df = 1,24	p = .05
READING COMPREHENSION						
Sex						
Male	2.631	0.857	26	3.347	0.695	15
Female	2.912	1.400	17	4.073	1.583	11
Total	2.742	1.096	43	3.654	1.186	26
F = 0.6697	df = 1,41	p = N.S.		F = 2.5233	df = 1,24	p = N.S.
TOTAL READING						
Sex						
Male	2.773	0.652	26	3.293	0.598	15
Female	3.247	1.356	17	4.191	1.583	11
Total	2.960	1.004	43	3.673	1.186	26
F = 2.3651	df = 1,41	p = N.S.		F = 4.0793	df = 1,24	p = .05

TABLE VI

A NORM-REFERENCED COMPARISON OF PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST PERFORMANCE
P.S. 316

GRADE	NORM	VARIABLE	MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENT	STANDARD SCORE	PERCENTILE
3	Beginning Grade 3	Total Pre-Test	3.0	56	46
	End Grade 3	Total Post-Test	3.7	63	58
4	Beginning Grade 4	Total Pre-Test	2.9	55	22
	End Grade 4	Total Post-Test	3.6	62	28
5	Beginning Grade 5	Total Pre-Test	2.8	54	20
	End Grade 5	Total Post-Test	3.4	60	22
6	Beginning Grade 6	Total Pre-Test	3.3	59	32
	End Grade 6	Total Post-Test	3.9	65	36

TABLE VII

t-TESTS FOR NEW YORK CITY
LANGUAGE ASSESSMEN BATTERY:
PRE-TEST, POST-TEST COMPARISON OF MEANS
I.S. 320

VARIABLE	N of CASES	RAW SCORE MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	CORRELATION	t-VALUE	df	ONE-TAIL PROBABILI
READING								
Pre-Test	42	19.38	12.10	1.87	0.919	12.52	41	0.00
Post-Test		31.03	14.82	2.29				
WRITING								
Pre-Test	42	13.10	6.21	0.96	0.96	10.59	41	0.00
Post-Test		15.88	5.49	0.85				
LISTENING								
Pre-Test	42	32.81	13.85	2.14	0.95	6.10	41	0.00
Post-Test		36.83	12.56	1.94				
SPEAKING								
Pre-Test	42	17.45	11.77	1.82	0.96	9.21	41	0.00
Post-Test		22.38	9.92	1.53				
TOTAL								
Pre-Test	42	82.60	35.36	5.46	0.97	16.58	41	0.00
Post-Test		105.60	34.75	5.36				

TABLE VIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE:
A COMPARISON OF TEST PERFORMANCE BY GRADE
I.S. 320

	PRE-TEST			POST-TEST		
VARIABLE	MEAN	S.D.	N	MEAN	S.D.	N
READING						
Grade						
6	15.632	9.311	19	25.889	11.219	18
7	23.389	15.640	18	34.667	19.950	15
8	20.462	7.785	13	35.222	7.612	9
Total	19.680	11.963	50	31.024	14.822	42
F=2.0669 p=N.S.	df=2,47			F=1.9854 p=N.S.	df=2,39	
WRITING						
Grade						
6	11.684	5.812	19	14.500	5.361	18
7	15.278	7.258	18	17.000	6.118	15
8	14.077	5.515	13	16.778	4.494	9
Total	13.600	6.376	50	15.881	5.487	42
F=1.554 p=N.S.	df=2,47			F=1.0024 p=N.S.	df=2,39	
LISTENING						
Grade						
6	29.684	11.695	19	33.889	11.412	18
7	39.611	11.521	18	42.067	10.187	15
8	24.769	20.266	13	34.000	16.447	9
Total	31.980	15.300	50	36.833	12.562	42
F=4.4441 p=.05	df=2,47			F=2.1375 p=N.S.	df=2,39	
SPEAKING						
Grade						
6	17.368	10.652	19	22.111	8.387	18
7	19.056	12.790	18	23.133	11.825	15
8	15.923	11.821	13	21.667	10.392	9
Total	17.600	11.585	50	22.381	9.917	42
F=0.2737 p=N.S.	df=2,47			F=0.0698 p=N.S.	df=2,39	
TOTAL						
Grade						
6	74.368	28.843	19	96.944	30.404	18
7	97.000	40.543	18	115.467	40.925	15
8	75.154	38.783	13	106.444	30.684	9
Total	82.720	36.897	50	105.595	34.750	42
F=2.2124 p=N.S.	df=2,47			F=1.1756 p=N.S.	df=2,39	

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE:
A COMPARISON OF TEST PERFORMANCE BY SEX
I.S. 320

	PRE-TEST			POST-TEST		
VARIABLE	MEAN	S.D.	N	MEAN	S.D.	N
READING						
Sex: Male	18.174	12.364	23	29.571	15.952	21
Female	20.963	11.690	27	32.476	13.837	21
Total	19.680	11.963	50	31.024	14.822	42
F=0.6705 p=N.S.	df=1,48			F=0.3974 p=N.S.	df=1,40	
WRITING						
Sex: Male	13.609	6.308	23	15.857	5.313	21
Female	13.593	6.553	27	15.905	5.787	21
Total	13.600	6.376	50	15.881	5.487	42
F=0.0001 p=N.S.	df=1,48			F=0.0006 p=N.S.	df=1,40	
LISTENING						
Sex: Male	28.783	12.377	23	32.667	12.200	21
Female	34.704	17.171	27	41.000	11.756	21
Total	31.980	15.300	50	36.833	12.562	42
F=1.8939 p=N.S.	df=1,48			F=5.0807 p=.05	df=1,40	
SPEAKING						
Sex: Male	20.217	11.774	23	24.381	9.615	21
Female	15.370	11.153	27	20.381	10.037	21
Total	17.600	11.585	50	22.381	9.917	42
F=2.2288 p=N.S.	df=1,48			F=1.7392 p=N.S.	df=1,40	
TOTAL						
Sex: Male	80.783	33.603	23	102.429	34.967	21
Female	84.370	40.051	27	108.762	35.097	21
Total	82.720	36.897	50	105.595	34.750	42
F=0.1153 p=N.S.	df=1,48			F=0.3432 p=N.S.	df=1,40	

TABLE X

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAM TUTORS

SEX	N	%
Female	30	100
Male	0	0
Total	30	100

GRADE		
Eleventh	1	3
Twelfth	29	97
Total	30	100

ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION	N	%
Black	24	80
Spanish	3	10
Unknown	3	10
Total	30	100

ESTIMATED HIGH SCHOOL AVERAGE		
70-74	1	3
75-79	3	10
80 and above	23	77
Unknown	3	10
Total	30	100

LANGUAGE FLUENCY		
English Only	24	80
Spanish	5	17
French	1	3
Total	30	100

PLANS TO ATTEND COLLEGE		
Yes	30	100
No	0	0
Total	30	100

CAREER CHOICE		
Doctor	10	33
Nurse	5	17
Teacher	1	3
Secretary	2	7
Other	4	13
Undecided	8	27
Total	30	100

TABLE XI

t-TESTS FOR GORDON PERSONAL INVENTORY:
PRE-TEST, POST-TEST COMPARISON OF MEANS

VARIABLE	N of CASES	PERCENTILE: HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	t-VALUE*	df	ONE-TAIL PROBABILITY
CAUTIOUSNESS								
Pre-Test	30	79	27.00	5.51	1.00	1.07	29	N.S.
Post-Test		72	25.50	5.31	0.97			
ORIGINAL THINKING								
Pre-Test	30	84	27.53	4.04	0.74	1.82	29	N.S.
Post-Test		77	25.83	4.31	0.79			
PERSONAL RELATIONS								
Pre-Test	30	73	26.63	4.74	0.87	1.46	29	N.S.
Post-Test		61	24.80	4.99	0.91			
VIGOR								
Pre-Test	30	77	26.97	5.11	0.93	0.23	29	N.S.
Post-Test		77	26.67	4.92	0.90			

*T-value of 2.05 or greater is necessary for a significant difference at the .05 level.

UMBRELLA PROGRAM
PROJECT MINI-TEACHER

Mr. John Economos, Coordinator
Mr. Sheldon Falleck, Teacher PS 316
Mr. Robert Schneider, Teacher IS 320

PRE-QUESTIONNAIRE (TUTEES)

Directions: Please circle your choice.

1. Where did you hear about this program?
   A. School (13, 21%) B. Friends (13, 21%) C. Teacher (35, 57%)

2. What do you want to do in this program?
   A. play games (10, 17%) B. read (34, 58%) C. write (10, 17%) D. eat (5, 8%)

3. Did your mother tell you to come to this program?
   A. yes (50, 85%) B. no (9, 15%)

4. Do you think you will like the program?
   A. yes (55, 93%) B. no (4, 7%)

5. Would you like to have your own teachers teach you in this program or some new teacher?
   A. our teacher (19, 31%) B. new teacher (42, 69%)

6. Would you like to come to this program Monday--Friday?
   A. yes (50, 82%) B. no (11, 18%)

7. Do you feel this program can help you in reading?
   A. yes (59, 97%) B. no (2, 3%)

8. Are you eager to register for this program next year?
   A. yes (52, 85%) B. no (9, 15%)

9. Do you feel at this point you would like to continue this program next year?
   A. yes (49, 82%) B. no (4, 7%) C. no feelings (7, 12%)

10. What type of materials would you like to use in this program?

UMBRELLA PROGRAM

PROJECT MINI-TEACHER

Mr. John Economos, Coordinator
Mr. Sheldon Fallek, Teacher PS 316
Mr. Robert Schneider, Teacher PS 320

POST QUESTIONNAIRE (TUTEES)

Directions: Please circle your choice

1. What did you enjoy the greatest in this program?
   A. reading and math games (22,27%) B. tests (4,5%) C. reading and discussion (34,41%) D. snacks (23,28%)

2. Do you feel the tutors were too strict?
   A. yes (20,22%) b. no (30,33%) C. a little (40,44%)

3. Would your rather have boys or girls as tutors?
   A. yes B. no C. no difference

4. Do you feel you were helped in this program?
   A. yes (66,81%) B. no (5, 6%) C. a little (10,12%)

5. Would you like to continue this program next year?
   A. yes (68,82%) B. no (9,11%) C. no feelings (6,7%)

6. Would you like to see the program expanded next year to 3 hours a day 5 days a week?
   A. yes (42,51%) B. no (31,37%) C. no feelings (10,12%)

7. What would you like to see dropped in this program?
   A. reading and discussion (10,12%) B. reading games (12,15%) C. snacks (4,5%) D. tests (54,68%)

8. Would you ask your friends to register for the program?
   A. yes (53,66%) B. no (6,8%) C. a little (21,26%)

9. Did you like this program?
   A. yes (64,78%) B. no (3,4%) C. a little (15,18%)

PLEASE WRITE BELOW AND ON THE OPPOSITE SIDE OF THIS PAPER IF NECESSARY, YOUR FEELINGS CONCERNING THIS PROGRAM.

UMBRELLA PROGRAM
PROJECT MINI-TEACHER

Mr. John Economos, Coordinator
Mr. Sheldon Fallek, Teacher IS 316
Mr. Robert Schneider, Teacher IS 320

POST QUESTIONNAIRE (TUTORS)

Direction: Please circle your choice.

1. How would you grade your success with the tutees in this program?
(1 is lowest, 5 is highest)

A. 2	B. 3	C. 1	D. 4	E. 5
(--)	(7, 23%)	(--)	(14, 47%)	(9, 30%)

2. How would you grade yourself in being able to communicate with your tutees?
(1 is lowest, 5 is highest)

A. 2	B. 3	C. 1	D. 4	E. 5
(2, 7%)	(2, 7%)	(--)	(11, 37%)	(15, 50%)

3. Do you feel you were successful in serving as a model for the tutees?

A. yes	B. no	C. a little
(29, 97%)	(--)	(1, 3%)

4. Did the tutees benefit from this program?

A. yes	B. no	C. a little
(27, 90%)	(--)	(3, 10%)

5. What type of materials do you feel helped these tutees the greatest?

A. books	B. reading and math games	C. crossword puzzles
(1, 3%)	(9, 30%)	(--)

D. reading passage with discussion
(20, 67%)

6. Do you feel this program provided you with motivation to become a teacher?

A. yes	B. no
(16, 59%)	(11,41%)

7. What do you feel the tutees enjoyed the greatest in this program?

A. testing	B. reading and math games	C. snacks
(2, 7%)	(13, 45%)	(8, 28%)

D. reading comprehension
(6, 21%)

8. What did you enjoy the greatest in this program?

A. reading comprehension	B. discussion with tutees	
(4, 14%)	(17, 59%)	
C. teaching of methods by Mr. Economos		D. reading and math games
(6, 21%)		(2, 7%)

9. Would you recommend this program to your friends?

A. yes	B. no
(28, 97%)	(1, 3%)

10. Would you advise parents to register their children for next year's program?
(yes 30, 100%)

*PLEASE WRITE BELOW AND ON OPPOSITE SIDE OF THE PAPER IF NECESSARY, YOUR FEELINGS CONCERNING THE PROGRAM.

UMBRELLA PROGRAM
PROJECT MINI-TEACHER

Mr. John Economos, Coordinator
Mr. Sheldon Fallek, Teacher IS 316
Mr. Robert Schneider, Teacher IS 320

POST QUESTIONNAIRE (PARENT)

Dear Parent:

Below are questions that apply to your child's afternoon program. Please circle your response, and have your child return completed form to his teacher.

Thanking you for your efforts, support and understanding in this most vital program.

Very truly yours,

John Economos
Coordinator

**Please Do Not Sign Form

1. Why did you agree to have your child attend this program?
   A. help his reading (48,77%) B. meet people (1,2%) C. recreational purposes (9,15%)
   D. keep him in school longer and thus out of the house (4,6%)

2. Did your child show interest in this program?
   A. yes (33,52%) B. no (2,3%) C. a little (28,44%)

3. Do you object to having the program expanded to 5 days a week next year?
   A. yes (24,38%) B. no (29,46%) C. no feelings (10,16%)

4. Do you like coming periodically and observing this program in progress?
   A. Yes (50,79%) B. no (3,5%) C. no feelings (10,16%)

5. Would you recommend this program to your friends and neighbors?
   A. yes (55,89%) B. no (4,6%) C. no feelings (3,5%)

6. Would you like to have your son (daughter) speak more of their native language in this program?
   A. yes (23,38%) B. no (26,43%) C. no feelings (12,20%)

(continued)

7. How would you grade your child in his (her) speaking of English now that he is finishing the program?
   A. excellent (23,38%) B. good (32,53%) C. no difference (1,2%) D. worse than before (4,7%)

8. Do you feel the tutors in this program
   A. were too easy (19,35%) B. did not give enough homework (16,29%) C. were too strict (1,2%)

   D. should be allowed to punish the child when necessary (19,35%

9. Would you like your child to continue this program next year?
   A. yes (47,80%) B. no (3,5%) C. no feelings (9,15%)

10. Do you feel your child benefitted from this program?
    A. yes (41,66%) b. no (6,10%) C. little (12,19%) D. no feelings (3,5%)

*PLEASE DO NOT SIGN THIS FORM